

**REMARKS**

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1, 4-16 and 19-37 remain pending.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 16-17 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP 831319 (EP 319). Claims 1-2, 7, 15-17, 21-22, 26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Davies et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,425,263 (Davies). Claims 3, 8-14, 18, 23-25, 27-33 and 35-37 are said to contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 2 and 3, thereby rendering claim 1 patentable. Claim 16 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 17 and 18, thereby rendering claim 16 patentable. Claims 25, 27, 28, 31-33 and 35 have been rewritten in independent form, thereby rendering them allowable. Further, dependent claims 4 and 5 have been amended to be dependent on amended claim 1; dependent claims 19-20 have been amended to be dependent on amended claim 16; and dependent claims 6-7, 15, 26 and 34 are now dependent on allowable independent claims.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Davies, as mentioned above. Claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form, and features that the vaporizing section includes an inlet port opening to supply a gaseous matter other than the vaporized component for the substance held on the substrate holder so that the gaseous matter is fed with the vaporized component toward the detector, wherein the inlet port is capable of having an opening area sufficiently large for introducing the substrate from an outside of the apparatus onto the substrate holder through the open area. In other words, the inlet port is used to

introduce both the gaseous matter other than the vaporized component and the substrate.

On the other hand, Davies discloses an inlet port that is clearly insufficiently large for the substrate to pass therethrough. In other words, the inlet port for introducing the gaseous matter is not large enough for the substrate to be introduced according to Davies.

Claim 22 has also been rewritten in independent form, and features that the inlet port through which the gaseous matter is supplied is arranged to surround the front surface as seen in a stacking direction in which the substance and the substrate are stacked. However, as shown by Fig. 2 of Davies, the front surface of the substrate surrounds the inlet port as seen in the stacking direction, which is opposite to the arrangement required by claim 22. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentably distinguishable from Davies.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to

the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. ASA-1175).

Respectfully submitted,  
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

\_\_\_\_\_/Daniel J. Stanger/  
Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb  
(703) 684-1120